

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/771,543	02/05/2004	Kenneth Jacobs	081589-0307593	2808
909	7590 12/15/2005		EXAMINER	
PILLSBUR' P.O. BOX 10	Y WINTHROP SHAW	REDMAN, JERRY E		
MCLEAN, V			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
• *			3634	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	A 11 41 A1	A 1: A / - \				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office A - 4' O	10/771,543	JACOBS, KENNETH				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jerry Redman	3634				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 Se	entember 2005					
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allower		osecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	·					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13 and 15-21</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13 and 15-21</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priorical statement. 	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

A new second non-final action is herein attached below.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-8, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Farris et al. As shown in Figure 3, Farris et al. disclose a wheel guide assembly for a sliding door (12) comprising a mounting structure (72) with a body portion (the portion to the left) and a top portion (70) having at least one axle with a longitudinal axis with a flat non-cylindrical surface, at least one wheel (48) having a hub opening portion (the inner surface) and an outer tire surface portion and the at least one wheel (48) is rotatably mounted to the at least one axle and guided within a track (50) such tolerances between the wheel (48) and the door (12) are taken up by the ellipsoidal shape axle as the wheel is guided within the track (50).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-13, 16, 18, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farris et al. in view of Gehrke. All of the elements of the instant

Application/Control Number: 10/771,543

Art Unit: 3634

invention are discussed in detail above except providing a central portion of the wheel

Page 3

with a plurality of fingers that engage the axle. Gehrke disclose a mounting structure

(12) with a central opening for an axle having a plurality of fingers. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the wheel

opening of Farris et al. with a plurality of fingers as taught by Gehrke since the plurality

of fingers allows the axle to be more easily attached and removed without damaging the

axle or structure mounted thereto.

The applicant's arguments have been considered but are not deemed

persuasive. It appears that the applicant's arguments are more limiting than that of the

claims. The applicant recites the wheel having a first material and a second material

but fails to state that the first material is different than the second material.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jerry Redman

at telephone number 571-272-6835.

Jerry Redman

Primary Examiner